

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHTC #0107/01 0501543
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O 191543Z FEB 09
FM AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2536
INFO RUEAIIA/CIA WASHDC PRIORITY
RUCPDO/DEPT OF COMMERCE WASHDC PRIORITY
RHEBAAA/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC PRIORITY
RHEHNSC/NSC WASHDC PRIORITY
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHDC PRIORITY
RHMFIUU/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC//OSAC PRIORITY

UNCLAS THE HAGUE 000107

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

STATE FOR ISN/CB, VCI/CCA, L/NPV, IO/MPR,
SECDEF FOR OSD/GSA/CN,CP>
JOINT STAFF FOR DD PMA-A FOR WTC
COMMERCE FOR BIS (ROBERTS AND DENYER)
NSC FOR FLY
WINPAC FOR WALTER

E.O. 12958: N/A
TAGS: [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [CWC](#)
SUBJECT: CWC: GOVERNMENT EXPERTS MEETING TO CONSIDER THE
SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD (SAB) REPORT TO THE SECOND
REVIEW CONFERENCE

REF: A. STATE 12311
[1](#)B. NOTE BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL RC-2/DG.1 DATED 28
FEBRUARY 2008

This is CWC-08-09.

[1](#)1. (U) This cable reports on subject meeting held
in The Hague 11-13 February 2009, and is organized
along the lines of the meeting agenda. Ref A is
U.S. guidance for the meeting. US officials
attending the meeting were Richard D'Andrea
(Department of State ISN/CB) and Larry Denyer
(Department of Commerce BIS).

[1](#)2. (U) Agenda Items 1 and 2 were Opening of the
Session and Adoption of the agenda respectively,
and both were conducted by the Executive Council
Chairman without comment.

[1](#)3. (U) Agenda Item 3, Welcome address by the
Director-General. The DG welcomed the delegations,
stressed the importance of the SAB work and the
review by Government Experts, and said that he
looked forward to a meaningful report to the
Executive Council on future SAB work.

[1](#)4. (U) Agenda Item 4, Introduction to the Note by
the Director-General. The DG gave a cursory review
of his Note on the SAB Report (ref B), and ended
with a request for continued support for the SAB.
The DG's review was comprehensive and did not add
any new topics or issues. Next, Philip Coleman,
SAB Chairman, reviewed the SAB report and like the
DG was comprehensive and did not add any new topics
or issues.

[1](#)5. (U) Agenda Item 5, Advances in science and
technology was deferred in favor of Agenda Item 6,
Schedules of chemicals, which was handled by Ralf
Trapp, the meeting moderator. Working from the SAB
report text (contained in ref B), Dr. Trapp covered
paragraphs 3.1) 3.14 to determine if any States
Parties had any changes to the content and
recommendations for further SAB work. Dr. Trapp

skillfully moved through the paragraphs deftly dealing with interventions predominantly from Iran, India, Canada, and Italy, and concluded that there were no changes.

¶6. (U) Agenda Item 6, Issues related to Verification, specifically On- and off-site sampling and analysis, and Analysis of biomedical samples. Again Dr. Trapp, working with the SAB report text, covered paragraphs 4.1-4.13 successfully addressing all interventions from Italy, France, Iran, and India; and concluded that there were no changes needed to the SAB report.

¶7. (U) Agenda Item 7, Destruction of chemical weapons. When Dr. Trapp opened discussion of paragraphs 5.1 and 5.2 of the SAB report, Iran intervened to ask for an interpretation of the meaning of the word, "technologies" as addressed in paragraph 5.1. Dr. Trapp agreed to put an explanation in the report. Ukraine then intervened to propose that the SAB look into increases in the size of temporary storage areas for chemical weapons pending destruction and the impact on destruction schedules. The U.S. intervened to explain that for the United States at least the sizes of temporary storage areas were fixed and had no impact on the destruction schedule. Additionally the U.S. pointed out that paragraph 5.1 specifically addressed chemical weapons destruction technologies, and for the United States, those included CW destruction by incineration or by neutralization followed by destruction of the neutralization products. Dr. Trapp promptly moved on to paragraph 5.2 dealing with technologies associated with the recovery of old and abandoned chemical weapons (OACW). China intervened to underscore the importance of further SAB work in this area. Japan also intervened to express their support for the report of the 11th meeting of the SAB as adopted at EC-54. There were no further interventions and the meeting adjourned for the day.

¶8. (U) Agenda Item 8 Assistance and protection against the effects of chemical weapons, and international cooperation. Dr. Trapp opened this topic with a brief overview of SAB report paragraphs 6.1) 6.4 and then invited comments. Iran launched a protracted intervention in which Iran reminded everyone that Iran was victimized by chemical weapons, that discussion of detection and other protection technologies was insufficient without also addressing equal availability of detection instruments to all States Parties. The intervention continued by stating that the SAB should propose cooperative efforts among States Parties (read: including Iran) in the development of antidotes, medical treatments for victims, decontamination, and the like. The intervention went on to state what was becoming a recurring Iranian theme concerning the sharing of technical information among all States Parties; and concluded with an assertion that the Director-General has a mandate under Article X to help States Parties, and that the Technical Secretariat should be doing more in this regard. Dr. Trapp responded that the information in the literature is available to everyone and was fully discussed in the Zagreb workshop. The Czech Republic intervened pointing out that SAB considerations of protection against the effects of chemical weapons should include response to CW attack and industrial chemical accidents, intelligence gathering, chemical safety, protection of civilians and infrastructure, emergency medical response, forensic science, response to alleged use, and called for the establishment of a Temporary Working Group to study

these issues. Dr. Trapp responded that the SAB's focus is on the underlying science as opposed what amounts to policy-driven responses to these issues, and while he agreed in principle with both interventions he reminded everyone that the SAB is not resourced to undertake these issues. He then deftly moved the discussion on to the next agenda item.

¶9. (U) Agenda Item 9 Advances in science and technology. Because of the size and complexity of this item (paragraphs 2.1-2.14 of the SAB Report) Dr. Trapp divided the discussion into sections.

¶A. Convergence of chemistry and biology. Dr. Trapp opened this topic with a brief introduction and Iran intervened stating that Iran was unclear as to what the SAB was trying to accomplish. The Russian Federation intervened to ask that the SAB identify practical consequences of this convergence. Iran again intervened with a request for information on again intervened with a request for information on this convergence. Dr. Trapp made the point that ever more biological molecules are being synthesized in laboratories and that there is increasing overlap between the CWC and BWC. Dr. Trapp recounted the IUPAC study on this topic that preceded the First Review Conference and concluded that the convergence is well documented. He then moved on to the next section.

¶B. Accelerated discovery of chemicals. Having made the point previously about more biologically active molecules being synthesized in laboratories, Dr. Trapp opened the topic for discussion. Italy intervened to make the point that this is something that National Authorities should track and that the SAB should recommend best channels and topics within the voluminous amounts of data. Iran intervened to ask what the SAB meant by new chemicals for law enforcement pointing out that the CWC allows use of riot control agents (RCA). A back and forth exchange ensued between Iran and the moderator in which each tried to get the other to introduce the term, incapacitating agent, and neither side did. Finally Dr. Trapp called for a break and the discussion was terminated.

¶C. Nanotechnology and other matters. Dr. Trapp introduced this topic and Iran intervened to request information. The Czech Republic intervened with an example of how they use nanotechnology to get oxidation states of iron from zero to plus seven and then derive water purification applications using these unusual ions. Dr. Trapp maneuvered the discussion into technology for delivery systems and then added production technology thereby covering all the remaining SAB report paragraphs (2.5) 2.14) to the discussion. Paragraph 2.13 on other chemical production facilities (OCPF) drew the most attention with interventions by China, France, Iran, India, and Italy, but in the end there were no changes to the SAB recommendations. India had called for the deletion of paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 as not reflecting the current state of play of OCPF discussions. Dr. Trapp refused and pointed out that the SAB report was written prior to the Review Conference and reflected the thinking at the time. He then adjourned the session to prepare the draft report which he proposed to let delegations review. While he said he would welcome comments he pointed out that this would be his report as opposed to a consensus report.

¶10. (U) Agenda Item 10, Education and outreach in the context of the Convention. This agenda item

involved a cursory discussion of SAB report paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2. Dr. Trapp highlighted IUPAC efforts and Iran intervened to point out that outreach efforts go beyond the scientific issues and touch on ethical and moral issues better left to policy making organs. Experts concluded that policy making organs and National Authorities need to be involved in outreach efforts to raise awareness of the Convention.

¶11. (SBU) Agenda Item 11, Adoption of the report. Dr. Trapp produced and distributed a draft for experts review and comment making it clear that this would be his report rather than a consensus report. While he welcomed comments he reserved the right to take them or not at his discretion. The U.S. intervened to request that a summary list of topics that the SAB should further assess and topics the SAB should continue to monitor be added to the report, and Dr. Trapp agreed. The draft report was a factual account of the proceedings free of objectionable content. U.S. experts agreed on several minor edits, discussed these with Dr. Trapp privately the following morning before the meeting, and Dr. Trapp accepted them. Additionally, Dr. Trapp handed out the list of topics that had been previously requested. The meeting convened and a paragraph by paragraph review ensued. Dr. Trapp tried to accommodate any reasonable edits and was surprisingly flexible. At the end of the review process Iran proposed adding a paragraph about the importance of the meeting implying that further such meetings should occur. Dr. Trapp declined to add such a paragraph or any other "judgmental" characterizations. The U.S., France, Sweden, Germany, Ireland, UK, Canada, and Japan intervened in support of Dr. Trapp. The report is yet to be finalized to incorporate comments from experts.

¶12. (U) Closure of the meeting. The Chairman of the Executive Council resumed control of the meeting from the moderator intending to close the meeting. Iran intervened to object that the report was not finished and therefore could not be agreed. Dr. Trapp intervened to explain that the report would be a moderator's report as opposed to an approved report. Iran continued to argue for a consensus report. The U.S. intervened pointing out that this was a meeting of experts from capitals simply exchanging views without any official standing and that reference to consensus was inappropriate. Japan, France, Sweden, and Ireland intervened in support of this view. Iran continued to argue to the bitter end and finally requested that the report reflect that there were divergent views. The meeting was closed at 1408 hours local time on 13 February 2009.

¶13. (SBU) Comment: There was a sense of relief that the meeting had actually gone better than many experts had expected. The moderator's report will go to the Executive Council for its consideration. Ultimately the Director-General will decide what work the Scientific Advisory Board will take on in the future.

¶14. (U) This cable was drafted and cleared by Richard D'Andrea and Larry Denyer.

¶15. (U) Beik sends
GALLAGHER